Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
04 310 AUG 31 2004
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Docket No._____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

MOMOLU V. S. SIRLEAF, SR.

Petitioner

v.

ALLSTATE MOVING AND STORAGE

Respondents

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Maryland

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

MOMOLU V. S. SIRLEAF, SR., PRO SE
2819 Gatehouse Drive
Baltimore, Md. 21207
Tel. (410) 448-5218

American Business Solutions • 2725 Washington Blvd., Baltimore, MD 21230
(410) 644-5600

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. whether the grounds given by the Court of Appeals of Md. in declining to consider the merits of Petitioner's due process plea - (concerning not being served with notice or process by the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, prior to being punished by that court) - are adequate to preclude federal due process review.

2. Whether any Petitioner named as a defendant in any trial court is constitutionally obliged to engage in litigation when that court has not notified the said Petitioner of the action, and brought him under that court's authority, by formal process.

LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner: Momolu V. S. Sirleaf, Sr., Pro Se

2819 Gatehouse Drive

Baltimore, Md. 21207

Tel. (410) 448-5218

Respondent: Allstate Moving & Storage; **Counsel of Record:** Charles J. Janus, Esq.

6504 Old Branch Ave., #206

Temple Hills, Md. 20748

Tel. (301) 449-5212

Rule 29.6 Statement

Petitioner Momolu V. S. Sirleaf, Sr. is a private party.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

QUESTIONS PRESENTED i

LIST OF ALL PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING.....ii

RULE 29.6 STATEMENT.....iii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....v

OPINIONS AND ORDERS BELOW.....1

JURISDICTION.....2

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED.....2

STATUTES, GUIDELINES, AND

RULES INVOLVED.....2

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....3

RAISING & DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL

QUESTIONS BELOW 8

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....11

ARGUMENT.....12

CONCLUSION.....21

APPENDICES (A - F) ....a1 – f2

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

SUPREME COURT CASES

Davis v. Wechsler, 263 U. S. 22, 23-24
(10/22/1923) 19, 20

Douglas v. *Alabama* 380 U. S. 415, 422 (04/5/1965).....18

Insurance Corp. of Ireland, 456 U. S. at 702.....14

International Shoe Co. v. *Washington*,
326 U. S. 310, 316 (1945).....13

James v. Kentucky, 466 U.S. 341 (04/18/1984).....18

Mississippi Publishing Corp. v. *Murphree*,
326 U. S. 438, 444-445 (1946).....13

Murphy Brothers, Inc., Petitioner v. *Michetti Pipe*
Stringing, Inc. [No. 97-1909, decided 04/599] 12

Omni Capital Int'l, Ltd. v. *Rudolf Wolff & Co.*,
484 U. S. 97, 104 (1987).....13

Osborne v. *Ohio*, 495 U. S. 103, 122-125,

(04/18/1990) 15

Remon Lee **v.** *Mike Kemna, Supt., Crossroads*

Correct. Ctr. (No. 00-6933, 01/22/02)..... 14, 15, 16

Ruhrgas AG **v.** *Marathon Oil Co.* **et al.**

(No. 98-470, decided 05/17/99).....14

Staub v. City of Baxley, 355 U.S. 313 (01/13/1958).....18

MARYLAND CASES

County Exec., Prince George's Co. v. Doe,

300 Md. 445, 479 A.2d 352 (1984).....17

Flower World of Am., Inc. V. Whittington,

39 Md. App. 187, 385 A.2d 85 (1978).....17

Jolley v. State, 282 Md. 53, 384 A.2d 91 (1978).....16, 17

Md. Nat'l Cap. P & P Comm'n v Crawford

307 Md. 1, 511 A.2d 1079 (1986). ,.....17, 18

Neal v State, 272 Md. 323, 322 A.2d 887 (1974)) 16, 17

U.S. CONSTITUTION

Amendment V 2, 7, 16

Amendment XIV 2, 7, 16

CONSTITUTION OF MARYLAND

Article 2 of the Declaration of Rights 2, 7, 16

Article 19 of the Declaration of Rights 2, 7, 16

Article 4, Sec. 8. (c). 2, 7, 16, 19

MARYLAND STATUTES

§ 6-102 (a) 2, 7, 16, 19, 20

§ 6-201 (a); 2, 7, 16

MARYLAND RULES

Rule 1-321 (a) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-112..... .....2, 7, 16

Rule 2-114 (a) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-114 (b) (1) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-114 (b) (2) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-114 (b) (6) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-114 (b) (7) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-114 (b) (8) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-326 (a) 2, 7, 16

Rule 2-326 (b) 2, 7

Rule 2-401 (d) (2) 2

Rule 2-421 (b) 2, 10

Rule 2-422 (c) 2, 10

Rule 2-431..... 2

Rule 2-432 (a) 2

Rule 2-432 (b) (A) 2

Rule 2-432 (b) (D) 2

Rule 2-432 (b) (E) 2

Rule 2-432 (d) 2

Rule 2-432 (e) 2

Rule 2-433 (a) 3 (c) 2

Rule 16-202 (a) (6) 2, 7, 16

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully petitions for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Appeals of Maryland

OPINIONS BELOW

The Order of the Court of Appeals of Md. denying Petitioner's Appeal (App. A); the Order of the Court of Special Appeals of Md. dismissing Petitioner's Appeal (App. B); the Order of the Circuit Court for Baltimore County unconstitutionally punishing Petitioner for an alleged failure of discovery (App C); the first and only assignment from the Circuit Court for Baltimore, setting the deadline for discovery (App. D); the Order of the Circuit Court for Prince George's County stating that Case No. CAL 03-01992 would be closed, upon Respondent's payment of the required transfer fee (App. E); the Order of the District Court of Md. for Prince George's County, Md. transferring Case No.

0502-0000667-2003 to the Circuit Court for Prince George's County (App. F).

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the Court of Appeals of Md. was issued on 06/11/04. Petitioner invokes this Court's jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C.A. 1257 (a)

U.S. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Amendments V & XIV, Sec. 1.

CONSTITUTION OF MARYLAND: Articles 2 & 19 of the Declaration of Rights; Article 4, Sec. 8. (c).

STATUTES, GUIDELINES AND RULES

INVOLVED: Maryland Statutes & Rules: Courts & Judicial Proceedings - §§ 6-102 (a) & 6-201 (a); Md. Rules 1-321 (a); 2-114 (a), (b) (1), (2), (6), (7) and (8); 2-401 (d) (2); 2-421 (b); 2-422 (c); 2-431; 2-432 (a), (b) (A), (D) & (E); (d), (e); 2-433 (a) 3 (c); 16-202 (a) (6).

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

1. Petitioner accepted Respondent's proposal – (10 hours at $85.00/hr and $400 for packing materials, making a total of $1,250.00) – and signed a contract with Respondent, who, on 06/12/99 moved Petitioner's things from their home in North Potomac, Md. to Respondent's place of business in Rockville, Md. - (both places are located in Montgomery County); on 6/14/99, Petitioner agreed to pay an extra $750.00, and paid Respondent $2,000 cash, but the latter refused to give a receipt; instead, he fraudulently indicated it as an "advance deposit" on the copy of his contract (to which he had added $1,449. 50, after Petitioner had already signed it); on 6/15/99, Petitioner sent Respondent a letter pointing out their unethical business practices, but Respondent failed to take

corrective action – (even after several subsequent certified letters and telephone conversations).

2. Thus, on 01/14/00, Petitioner drove from New York (where he had relocated), and, in the hope of avoiding a costly law suit, reluctantly, paid Respondent an additional $7,140.00 (seven thousand one hundred and forty dollars) to cover all previous fraudulent charges, and any potential charges for the period up to 03/31/00, by which time Respondent should have given Petitioner all of his things; but, unfortunately, Respondent immediately embarked on further deception, and refused to show, or give Petitioner his things, because he said he didn't have anyone to remove the boxes, so Petitioner should wait until the next day (01/15/00); but, the following day, Respondent hid from Petitioner.

3. Thus, incredibly, after having received $9,140.00, - (for an original contract of $1,250.00) – Respondent fraudulently removed and hid Petitioner's things, in order to prevent him from taking them. Petitioner moved back to Maryland in December 2001; in March 2002, Respondent informed Petitioner that they had already sold Petitioner's things because they thought he was not returning to Maryland; Petitioner threatened to seek legal remedies; on 11/04/02 Respondent's attorney informed Petitioner that they would be selling the things they said they had already sold; on 11/15/02 Petitioner threatened in a certified letter to: "(i) press criminal fraud charges … and (ii) seek civil fraud damages … against (Respondent) …" Then, on 01/08/03, Respondent, preemptively, filed Case #

050200006672003 in the District Court of Md. For Prince George's County.

4. On 01/27/03, Petitioner filed (i) a demand for jury trial, and (ii) cross claims for fraud, damages & specific performance; on 01/31/03, the district Court, transferred the action to the Circuit Court of Md. For Prince George's County; on 02/24/03 Petitioner filed a motion (of improper venue) - to transfer the action to the Circuit Court for Baltimore County; on 02/27/03, Respondent (i) opposed this motion and (ii) filed a certificate regarding discovery in case # CAL-01992; on 03/03/03 Petitioner filed their reply; Respondent lost; and on 03/25/03, the Circuit Court For Prince George's County ordered that case # CAL-01992 would be closed upon Respondent's payment of the required transfer fee.

5. Petitioner waited to see whether Respondent would appeal, or pay the transfer fee; in either case, Petitioner would receive notice or process from the appropriate court, as required by law, - Article 4, Sec. 8. (c) of the Constitution of Maryland; Courts & Judicial Proceedings - §§ 6-102 & 6-201; Md. Rules 1-321 (a), 2-112, 2-114 (a), (b) (1), (2), (6), (7), (8) & 2-326 (a) & 16-202 – in order for Petitioner to file a response, as required by Md. Rule 2-326 (b).

6. However, no process or notice was ever sent; instead, six months later, Respondent mailed Petitioner "Motion to Compel Discovery and Request For Immediate Sanctions" (allegedly filed with the Circuit Court of Baltimore County in case # 03-C-03-4500); upon investigation, Petitioner learned that: (a) the case had

not yet been docketed, and no judge had been assigned; (b) in violation of the law of the land, no process or notice had been issued; (c) Respondent had not filed the required (i) notice of discovery; (ii) certificate "... certifying that (petitioner and respondent) are unable to reach agreement on the disputed issues. ..."; nor any motion to compel, as he falsely claimed.

RAISING & DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL QUESTIONS BELOW

7. On 10/06/03, Petitioner immediately filed a paper, which pointed out that the Circuit Court for Baltimore County had erred constitutionally by failing to serve him process, and could not legally exercise personal jurisdiction over him; but the court ignored both the federal and State constitutions, and punished Petitioner by granting Respondent's alleged "Motion to Compel Discovery and Request for Immediate Sanctions"

including (a) "an order of default against (Petitioner)"; (b) "Ordered, that (Respondent) be, and hereby is awarded Court costs and counsel fees from (Petitioner) ... as a result of having to file this motion, ..."; and (c) "Ordered that all Court costs and counsel fees awarded to (Respondent) be, and hereby are, reduced to a judgment against (Petitioner)"- (App. C).

8. Petitioner immediately appealed, respectively to the Court of Special Appeals, then to the Court of Appeals of Md., stating that: (a) the Circuit Court (i) had not served him with any process or notice; (ii) did not obtain personal jurisdiction over him; and (iii) had denied him due process, and equal protection as required by the law of the land, as well as the law of the State of Md.; (b) jurisdiction is a question of law, and is not dependent on the discretion of the court; (c) Judge

David (ii) had not given any schedule or plan; (iii) nor had he fixed any dates for pleadings, motions, discovery, etc., thereby rendering it impossible for him, Respondent, or Petitioner to determine a deadline by which Petitioner would be required "... to serve a response ... within 15 days after the date on which (Petitioner's) initial pleading or motion is required, whichever is later"[1]; (d) and, without these prerequisites, it is impossible for there to be a failure of discovery; (e) thus, Judge David had exceeded his jurisdiction, and lacked legal authority to sanction Petitioner; but both the Court of Special Appeals and the Court of Appeals failed to consider the merits of the constitutional issues raised by Petitioner; the former said the Appeal was premature (App. B); and the latter

---

[1] See Md. Rule 2-421 (b) and Md. Rule 2-422 (c).

said review by certiorari was not "desirable and in the public interest" (App. A).

8. Finally, as further proof that Petitioner was unconstitutionally punished, as this Petition to this Court was being prepared, Petitioner, **for the first time, received an assignment (See p. d3, App. D) from the Circuit Court dated 08/03/04 (10 months after the sanction order (of 10/23/03) for the alleged failure of discovery), setting the deadline for completing discovery as 09/25/04 (11 months after having already sanctioned Petitioner for the very alleged failure of discovery); but this cannot cure their unconstitutional and legal defects and harm to Petitioner.**

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

Certiorari is warranted because the Court of Appeals of Md. has decided an important federal question which

conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court in 12 cases, as well as its own decisions in 5 cases (see Argument below).

ARGUMENT

I(a). In *Murphy Brothers, Inc., Petitioner* v. *Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc. [No. 97-1909, decided 04/599]*, - an analogous removal case[2], - (from an Alabama state court to federal court) – in which the Respondent failed to properly serve the Petitioner, this Court, in reversing the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, observed:

> **"...We read ... provisions for removal in light of a bedrock principle: An individual or entity named as a defendant is not obliged to engage in litigation unless notified of the action, and**

[2] An action for damages for an alleged breach of contract and fraud.

brought under a court's authority, by formal process. ..."

Also, this Court added:

"...Service of process, under longstanding tradition in our system of justice, is fundamental to any procedural imposition on a named defendant. ..." See *International Shoe Co.* **v.** *Washington,326 U. S. 310, 316* **(1945);** *Omni Capital Int'l, Ltd.* **v.** *Rudolf Wolff & Co.,484 U. S. 97, 104* **(1987);** *Mississippi Publishing Corp.* **v.** *Murphree,326 U. S. 438, 444-445 (1946);* **then, this Court concluded that it would be very "...strange a change--to set removal apart from all other responsive acts, to render removal the sole instance in which one's procedural rights slip away before service of a summons,** ***i.e.,*** **before one is subject to any court's authority....**

I(b). In *Ruhrgas AG* **v.** *Marathon Oil Co.* **et al.** (*No. 98-470, decided 05/17/99*), this Court reversed the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, and held that personal and subject matter jurisdictions are equally essential, and when one is absent, the court is powerless to proceed to an adjudication; and the "...requirement that a court have personal jurisdiction flows ... from the Due Process Clause." (See *Insurance Corp. of Ireland, 456 U. S. at 702*)

II(a). In *Remon Lee* v. *Mike Kemna, Supt., Crossroads Correctional Center (No. 00-6933, decided 01/22/02)*, a Missouri trial court denied Lee's motion for continuance in order to present his witnesses (who had unexplainably left the court) to corroborate his planned alibi defense, (that he was in California with his family

at the time of the murder) – which surfaced at each stage of the proceedings; the Missouri Court of Appeals, ignored the merits of Lee's constitutional due process claims, - (just as the courts – (i) Circuit, (ii) Special Appeals and (iii) Appeals - of Md. did in this case) and disposed of the case on state procedural grounds - (Lee's failure to submit the motion in writing); the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit affirmed; and this Court, relying on *Osborne* v. *Ohio,* 495 U. S. 103, 122-125, (04/18/1990) reversed; and just like in *Lee,* Petitioner's ample and timely objections in this case brought the alleged federal errors to the attention of the trial and appellate courts, and they could have taken appropriate corrective actions to satisfy any legitimate state interests; but they failed to do so.

II(b). However, unlike *Lee*, the Court of Appeals of Md. disrespected Petitioner's constitutional rights, without even feigning to present any "independent and adequate" state ground – (initially developed by this Court in *Lee);* instead, while violating, and/or sanctioning the violation of Petitioner's rights under the federal constitution (Amendments V & XIV), they also committed errors in violation of state law, – (A) Constitution (Articles 2 & 19 of the Declaration of Rights; and Article 4, Sec. 8.), (B) Statutes (§§ 6-102 & 6-201), (C) (Md. Rules 1-321 (a), 2-112, 2-114 (a), (b) (1), (2), (6), (7), (8) & 2-326 (a) & 16-202), and (D) Published Opinions of the Court of Appeals of Md. which recognize Petitioner's absolute constitutional right to appeal in a situation as presented by this petition - (*[(a) Neal v State, 272 Md. 323, 322 A.2d 887 (1974*[3]*); (b) Jolley*

---

[3] As in this case, the Court of Special Appeals said that Neal's

v. State, 282 Md. 353, 384 A.2d 91 (1978[4]); (c) Flower World of Am., Inc. V. Whittington, 39 Md. App. 187, 385 A.2d 85 (1978[5]); (d)County Exec., Prince George's Co. v. Doe, 300 Md. 445, 479 A.2d 352 (1984)[6]; and (e) Md. Nat'l

---

appeal (claiming her constitutional right against double jeopardy) was premature, because the circuit court had properly exercised its discretion; but the Court of Appeals granted certiorari, disagreed, and held: (a) the assertion of such a defense was not subject to the circuit court's discretion, and (b) the denial of such an absolute constitutional right could be appealed immediately.

[4] The Court of Appeals reconfirmed its decision in Neal, when Jolley's right to a speedy trial, under Amendment VI. of the U. S. Constitution was denied.

[5] Although the Circuit Judge had authority to issue a Stay Order, he, nevertheless exceeded his jurisdiction (as in this case) when he designated Maryland as the situs for arbitration.

[6] In fact, the Court of Special Appeals was guided by this decision in a landlord tenant case - *[Legal Aid Bureau v. Farmer 74 Md.App. 707 (1988)* - An immediate appeal lies from a

Cap. P & P Comm'n v Crawford, 307 Md. 1, 511 A.2d 1079 (1986).

II©. However, even if the Court of Appeals of Md. felt that it had, asserted such a doctrine, this, in itself, presents a federal question; - in (i) *Douglas* v. *Alabama* 380 U. S. 415, 422 (04/5/1965); (ii) *James v. Kentucky, 466 U.S. 341 (04/18/1984),* and *(iii) Staub v. City of Baxley, 355 U.S. 313 (01/13/1958),* this Court reversed, respectively, the Court of Appeal of Alabama, Supreme Court of Kentucky and the Court of Appeals of Georgia, because, as in this case, petitioner's constitutional

---

sanctions order awarding attorney fees against counsel, otherwise, "...it may well be the only kind of money judgment for which an appeal of right to some appellate court would not exist".

rights[7] were not respected, and the decisions did not rest on independent and adequate state grounds.;

III. Finally, in *Davis v. Wechsler, 263 U. S. 22, 23-24 (10/22/1923)*, the Missouri Supreme Court had denied defendant's Petition for a writ of certiorari, because it said that General Order 18-A dealt only with the venue of the action, - (which it claimed had been waived by defendant's appearance) – and not jurisdiction; the order in that case required that all suits against carriers (under Federal control) be brought in a particular district or county, – (i. e. plaintiff's residence when the cause of action arose, or place where it arose); in this case, Article 4, Sec. 8. (c) of the Md. Constitution & § 6-

---

[7] They involved, respectively, (i) cross examination under confrontation clause in Amendment VI, (ii) jury instructions, right to remain silent under Amendment V, and (iii) Free speech under the First Amendment.

102 of Md.'s Courts & Judicial Proceedings – required this action to be properly brought initially, or removed and commenced in the county of Petitioner's residence, in accordance with due process of law; in reversing, this Court observed:

(Holmes, J.) "Whatever springes the State may set for those who are endeavoring to assert rights that the State confers, the assertion of federal rights, when plainly and reasonably made, is not to be defeated under the name of local practice.".

Thus Petitioner requests that this Court vacates the judgments of (i) the Court of Appeals of Md. and (ii) the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, Md.

CONCLUSION

The Petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

Momolu V. S. Sirleaf, Pro Se.

2819 Gatehouse Drive

Baltimore, Md. 21207

(410) 448-5218

August, 2004

APPENDIX A

MOMOLU V.S. SIRLEAF IN THE

COURT OF APPEALS

OF MARYLAND

Petition Docket No. 19

September Term, 2004

v. (No. 2011, Sept. Term, 2003,

Court of Special Appeals)

ALLSTATE MOVING AND STORAGE

ORDER

Upon consideration of the petition for a writ of certiorari to the Court of Special Appeals and the answer filed thereto in the above entitled case, it is ORDERED, by the Court of Appeals of Maryland, that the petition be, and it is hereby, denied as there has been no showing that review by certiorari is desirable and in the public interest.

/s/ Robert M. Bell

Chief Judge

DATE: June 11, 2004

APPENDIX B

Momolu Sirleaf	IN THE
Appellant	COURT OF SPECIAL APPEALS
vs	NO. 2011
Allstate Moving and Storage	September Term, 2003

ORDER

This Court having read and considered Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal, and Appellant's (1) Response to Appellee's Motion to Dismiss & (2) Request for Hearing, it is this 30th day of January, 2004, by the Court of Special Appeals,

ORDERED that Appellee's Motion to Dismiss Appeal is granted. The appeal is dismissed as premature. Maryland Rule 8-602 (a) (1).

For a Panel of the Court
consisting of Chief Judge Murphy,
Judge D. Eyler and Judge Barbera
CHIEF JUDGE'S SIGNATURE
APPEARS ON ORIGINAL ORDER

APPENDIX C

In The Circuit Court For Baltimore County, Maryland

Allstate Moving and Storage, Plaintiff

v. Case No. 03-C-03-4500

Momolu Sirleaf, Defendant

FILED OCT. 23, 2003

Upon consideration of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery and Request for Immediate Sanctions filed herein, any opposition thereto, and for good cause shown, it is this 21st day of Oct., 2003, by the Circuit Court for Baltimore County, Maryland

ORDERED, that Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Discovery and Request for Immediate Sanctions be, and hereby is, granted; and it is further,

ORDERED, that Defendant, MOMOLU SIRLEAF, be, and hereby is, directed to respond to Defendant's Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents in full by the 31st day of Oct., 2003; and it is further,

ORDERED, that if Defendant fails to comply with discovery deadline, he shall be held in contempt of this Court; and it is further,

ORDERED, that Defendant be foreclosed from the introduction of evidence or testimony regarding the Matters related to this case if he shall fail to comply with discovery as provided herein; and it is further,

ORDERED, that an Order of Default be entered against the Defendant, MOMOLU SIRLEAF; and it is further,

ORDERED, that Plaintiff, ALLSTATE MOVING AND STORAGE, be, and hereby is, awarded Court costs and counsel fees from the Defendant, MOMOLU SIRLEAF in the amount of $250- as a result of having to file this Motion, and it is further,

ORDERED, that all Court costs and counsel fees awarded to Plaintiff be, and hereby are, reduced to a judgment against Defendant.

Lawrence David

Judge

TRUE COPY TEST

Suzanne Mensh, Clerk

s/per Joan Jones

Deputy Clerk

d1

APPENDIX D

CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY

CIVIL ASSIGNMENT OFFICE

COUNTY COURTS BUILDING

401 BOSLEY AVENUE

P.O. BOX 6754

TOWSON, MARYLAND 21285-6754

Assignment Date: 08/03/04

Case Number: 03-C-03-004500 CN

Case Title: Allstate Moving And Storage vs Sirleaf

Momolu V S Sirleaf

2819 Gate House Drive

Baltimore MD 21207

The above case has been assigned to the CIVIL EXPEDITED W/MEDIATION and it is hereby ORDERED, that this matter be referred for CIVIL MEDIATION (ADR) before the following Court-appointed Mediator: MARK HOUSTON GRIMES ESQ

Telephone: 410-419-7757 and it is further,

ORDERED, that each party, through his or her counsel, is required to contact the mediator within 15 days of this order to arrange the date for the mediation conference, which must take place prior to the Meditation Deadline set forth in this Scheduling Order below, and it is further

ORDERED, that the parties shall compensate the Mediator, based on a rate approved by the Court and all costs are to be divided equally by the plaintiffs and defendants(s) in the case, unless agreed otherwise or ordered by the Court. (Note: If there are multiple parties, each side of the dispute will be responsible for paying a pro-rated share of the mediation costs. For example, if there are two plaintiffs and one defendant and total costs of the mediation are $300.00, each plaintiff would pay $75.00 and the defendant would pay $150.00), and it is further

ORDERED, that the attached CIVIL MEDIATION INSTRUCTIONS are incorporated as part of this Order.

If you have any questions concerning your track assignment, please contact: Joy M. Keller at (410) 887-3233. You must notify this coordinator within 15 days of the receipt of this order as to any conflict with the following dates:

1. Motions to Dismiss under MD. Rule 2-322(b) are due by 08/18/04
2. **Discovery must by completed by 09/25/04**
3. Motions (excluding Motions in Limine) are due by 10/10/04
4. Mediation (ADR) Deadline Date is 10/10/04
5. TRIAL DATE is 11/09/04

Civil Jury Trial; Start Time: 09:30AM; To Be Assigned; 2 DAYS MERITS

Honorable John Grason Turnbull II Judge

Special Assistance Needs: If any attorney or party who attends the mediation conference is in need of an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act, please contact the Court Administrator's Office at (410) 887-2687 or use the Court's TDO line, (410) 887-3081, or the Voice/TDD M.D. Relay Service, (800) 735-2258.

Voluntary Dismissal: Per Md. Rule 2-506, after an answer or motion for summary judgment is filed, a plaintiff may dismiss an action without leave of court by filing a stipulation of dismissal signed by all parties who have appeared in the action. The stipulation shall be filed with the Clerk's Office. Also, unless otherwise provided by stipulation or order of court, the dismissing party is responsible for all costs of the action.

cc: MARK HOUSTON GRIMES ESQ

Charles Janus

Issue Date 08/03/04

APPENDIX E

In The Circuit Court For Prince George's County, Maryland

Allstate Moving and Storage, Plaintiff

v. Case No. CAL 03-01992

Momolu Sirleaf, Defendant

FILED APRIL 23, 2003

DOCKET INFORMATION

Date: 03/25/03 Docket Number: 008 (014) - "ORDER OF COURT DATED 03/20/03 JUDGE MISSOURI ORDERED THAT THE DEF'S MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE AND IS HEREBY GRANTED AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT THE ABOVE CAPTIONED CASE IS HEREBY TRANSFERRED TO THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND, AND IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT THE PLA. IS (TO) PAY A TRANSFER FEE IN THE AMOUNT OF SIXTY DOLLARS ($60.00) AND

UPON PAYMENT THIS CASE IS TO BE
CLOSED STATISTICALLY, FD./SS COPIES MAILED
BY THE COURT TO CHARLES J JANUS AND
MOMOLU SIRLEAF ON 03/20/03"

f1

APPENDIX F

DISTRICT COURT OF MARYLAND FOR PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY 0502 COURTHOUSE,
BOURNE WING (V)
UPPER MARLBORO, MD 20772-3042

CIVIL CASE NO.: 0502 - 0000667 - 2003

COMPLAINT NO.: 001

TO: SIRLEAF, MOMOLU
2819 GATE HOUSE DR
BALTIMORE, MD 21207

ALLSTATE MOVING AND STORAGE

VS.

SIRLEAF, MOMOLU

DATE: 01/31/2003

COURT DOCKET UPDATE

THE COURT PROCEEDING IN THE ABOVE CASE, I.E. MERIT TRIAL ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED FOR APRIL 09, 2003 HAS BEEN CANCELED DUE TO REMOVAL TO CIRCUIT COURT BECAUSE JURY TRIAL PRAYED BY DEFENDANT.

ANY REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES SHOULD BE REQUESTED BY CONTACTING THE COURT IMMEDIATELY.
FOR QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS DOCUMENT TELEPHONE (301) 952-4080.
HEARING/SPEECH IMPAIRED CALLERS ONLY, TELEPHONE TTY/TT 1-800-925-9690 OR THROUGH MARYLAND RELAY SERVICE AT 1-800-735-2258 OR 711.
C1
008957A